## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

EDDIE J. SYKES,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 09-CV-0941-MJR-SCW
SARAH FARRIS and MARCIA HILL,	)	
Defendants.	)	

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

REAGAN, District Judge:

On November 9, 2009, Eddie J. Sykes filed suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, against 30 Defendants, alleging numerous constitutional violations. After the Court's threshold review and Plaintiff's failure to serve one Defendant (Oly Obadina), only two Defendants remain, Sarah Farris and Marcia Hill. Sykes alleges that these Defendants violated his Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment, in that they were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs.

On January 17, 2012, Magistrate Judge Stephen C. Williams submitted a Report and Recommendation ("the Report") pursuant to **28 U.S.C.** § **636(b)(1)(B)**, regarding Defendant Farris's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 52) and Defendant Hill's motion for partial summary judgment (Doc. 54). The Report finds that Sykes properly exhausted his administrative remedies, as required under 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), only as to administrative complaints filed in February and June 2009.

The Report was sent to the parties with a notice informing them of their right to appeal by way of filing "objections" within ten days of service of the Report. To date, none of the parties has filed objections. The period in which to file objections has expired. Therefore, pursuant

to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), this Court need not conduct de novo review. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140,

149-52 (1985).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 77) in its

entirety, and **GRANTS** in part and **DENIES** in part Defendant Farris's Motion for Summary

Judgment (Doc. 52) and **GRANTS in part and DENIES in part** Defendant Hill's Motion for

Partial Summary Judgment (Doc. 54). As a result of this ruling, the following claims remain in this

case:

1. That Defendant Farris violated Sykes' Eighth Amendment rights through deliberate

indifference to his prostate problems on or about April 1 to April 7, 2009 (the dates

referred to in Sykes' June 22, 2009 grievance);

2. That Defendant Hill violated Sykes' Eighth Amendment rights through deliberate

indifference to his alleged prostate problems on or about June 24, 2009;

3. That Defendant Hill's failure to address Sykes' concerns about a possible skin rash,

a symptom of crabs or MRSA, in February 2009, constitutes deliberate indifference to

Sykes' serious medical needs, in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 10th day of February, 2012

s/Michael J. Reagan
MICHAEL J. REAGAN

United States District Judge

2